

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL SORIANO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B216737

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. KA032893)

THE COURT:*

Michael Soriano appeals from an order imposing direct victim restitution after judgment following his plea of no contest to count 1, attempted murder (Pen. Code, §§ 664, 187, subd. (a)).¹

On February 20, 1997, appellant entered into a negotiated plea agreement, pursuant to which he pled no contest to count 1, attempted murder (§§ 664, 187, subd. (a)), and admitted the allegation that the crime was committed for the benefit of a criminal street gang (§ 186.22, subd.(b)). Count 2, mayhem (§ 205), was dismissed.

* BOREN, P. J., DOI TODD, J., CHAVEZ, J.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

Appellant was sentenced to a suspended eight-year state prison sentence and five years probation. On May 27, 1998, appellant was found in violation of his probation and the eight-year prison term was imposed. On May 5, 2009, after appellant served his sentence, the matter was set for hearing as to direct victim restitution. On May 20, 2009, appellant was ordered to pay the sum of \$46,000 to the State Victim Compensation Board to reimburse payments made to the victim from the restitution fund. It was further ordered that the liability is to be joint and several with codefendants Dameian Rodgers and Dale Kim.

We appointed counsel to represent him on this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no issues were raised.

On February 26, 2010, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant’s attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order under review is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.